



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,537	03/17/2004	Christopher W. Blackburn	1842.031US1	3506

70648

7590

03/29/2011

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/WMS GAMING

P.O. BOX 2938

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

PHILLIPS, III, ALBERT M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2159

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/29/2011

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@slwip.com

request@slwip.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/802,537

Applicant(s)

BLACKBURN ET AL.

Examiner

Albert Phillips

Art Unit

2159

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-940)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the RCE filed on 1/31/11.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-12 are allowed.

5 Claims 14-25 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

10 (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15 **Claims 14-23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drummond (U.S. Patent App. Pub No. 2001/0014881 A1) in view of Gatto (U.S. Patent No. 6,916,247) and further in view of Web Services Architecture, W3C Working Draft 14 November 2002 [hereinafter WSA] and further**
20 **in view of Jewell, Java Web Services, March 2002.**

With respect to claim 14, Drummond teaches "A gaming network system providing a message director service, the gaming network system comprising: a plurality of gaming clients communicably coupled to the gaming network, each of the gaming clients comprising one or more processors executing from a memory a message
25 director service on a server computer having one or more processors and

communicably coupled to the gaming network, wherein the message director service receives an event message from one or more of a plurality of gaming clients on the gaming network and in response receiving the event message the message director service utilizes configuration data to route the event message to one or more gaming clients on the gaming network” in para 0131 lines 1-5, para. 0002 lines 3-9, para. 0099 lines 5-8, and Figure 2 item 40, 43, and 44 (ATMs can be gaming machines) (ATMs 44, 43, 40 are all coupled to a network. This is a gaming network in that all ATMs could be gaming machines); para. 0134 last 6 lines, para. 0113 lines 3-9, and para. 0114 lines 1-7 (Bus service (message director service) sends service proxy (service information) to lookup service (discovery service) during the “discovery and join” process. Lookup service is a discovery service in that other services “discover” the bus service using the lookup service. See also para. 0131 lines 1-6.) in para. 0134 last 6 lines and para 0135 lines 1-9 (User interface service (client) sends method call (event message) to bus service); para. 0104 lines last 4 lines, para. 0133 last 3 lines, para. 0135 lines 1-9 (Bus service receives events from the network and routes the message to the other services. Bus service contains service proxies (configuration data) used to control the devices).

It appears Drummond fails to explicitly teach that the event messages routed by the bus service (message director service) route the event messages to one or more *gaming* clients.

However, Gatto teaches gaming clients receiving event messages in col. 13 lines 8-13, col. 14 lines 13-24 and the abstract.

Gatto and Drummond are analogous are because they are from the same field of endeavor—gaming machine configuration.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify routing of messages to devices as taught in Drummond to include routing those messages to

5 Gatto's gaming machines.

The motivation would have been to provide access to state of the art gaming machines over a network to compete with other technologies such as PC gaming and interactive TV in order to attract a younger audience to gaming. See Gatto col. 2 lines 18-22, the abstract, and col. 2 lines 25-36.

10 Drummond further teaches "a discovery agent on a computer having one or more processors communicably coupled to the gaming network, wherein the discovery agent is operable to: receive service information from message director service" in para 0131 lines 1-5, para. 0002 lines 3-9, para. 0099 lines 5-8, and Figure 2 item 40, 43, and 44 (ATMs can be gaming machines) (ATMs 44, 43, 40 are all coupled to a network. This is
15 a gaming network in that all ATMs could be gaming machines); para. 0134 last 6 lines, para. 0113 lines 3-9, and para. 0114 lines 1-7 (Bus service (message director service) sends service proxy (service information) to lookup service (discovery service) during the "discovery and join" process. Lookup service is a discovery service in that other services "discover" the bus service using the lookup service. See also para. 0131 lines
20 1-6.)

"determine if the message director service is authentic and authorized for the gaming network" in para. 0128 lines 5-20 (lookup service can determine if service's

transactions are "authorized" by requiring the negotiation of a new lease. The services are "authentic" if they are registered).

"publish the service information to a service repository to make the

message director service available on the gaming network" in para. 0129 lines 1-

5 3 and para. 0117 lines 1-3 (Service information is not published (available) until discovery and join is completed).

Drummond also teaches a discovery agent (lookup service) receiving a discovery request from a gaming client in para. 0002 lines 1-10 (gaming machine), and para. 0059
10 lines 1-15 (gaming client).

It appears Drummond/Gatto fail to explicitly teach

"wherein a gaming client of the plurality of gaming clients operable to issue a request for the **location of the message director service** to the discovery agent" in its entirety (emphasis on what Drummond fails to teach).

15 However, WSA teaches receiving a discovery request from a client for the location of a message director service on p. 14 last 3 lines, p. 15 lines 1-2, p. 12 figure, and p. 14 lines 1-4 (service provider is message director service).

WSA and Drummond/Gatto are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor--web services.

20 It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the discovery request received by the discovery agent as taught in Drummond to include the location of the message director service as taught by WSA.

The motivation would have been provide a way for the requesting entity to find the description(s) of the service. See WSA p. 8 lines 14-20.

In the alternative, even if Drummond/Gatto/WSA fails to explicitly teach "authenticating" a web service, Jewell teaches authenticating a web service on p. 2 last
5 two paragraphs and p. 6 last two paragraphs (web services published in UDDI require authentication).

Drummond/Gatto/WSA and Jewell are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor--web services.

It would have been obvious to modify the registration of services in Drummond et
10 al. to include authentication as taught by Jewell.

The motivation would have been security.

Drummond further teaches "and use the service information received from the discovery agent to issue a registration request to the message director service wherein the message director service is further operable to: receive the registration request from
15 the gaming client and" in para. 0116 lines 1-10 and para. 0171 lines 7-18 (Registration of client, which is part of the join and discover process, includes service proxy (service information). See also para. 0130 lines 1-10.).

"process one or more service requests between the gaming client and the message director service, said service requests conforming to an internetworking
20 protocol" in para. 0059 lines 8-12, para. 0099 lines 8-14, and para. 0113 lines 8-11 (lookup service processes requests (which are messages) from ATM (gaming client) to communicate with services on the host system)

With respect to claim 15, it appears Drummond fails to explicitly teach “The gaming network system of claim 14, wherein the message director service *comprises a web service*”.

5 However, Gatto teaches a web service in col. 15 lines 49-56. (.net and J2EE are commonly referred to as “web services”) Drummond and Gatto are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor—gaming machines configuration.

10 At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Drummond and Gatto before him or her, to modify the lookup service of Drummond to include the web services of Gatto.

 The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a universal solution over the Internet that would offer flexible and dynamic discovery of Net/Web services. See *Id.* and Gatto col. 16 lines 13-17.

15 Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gatto with Drummond to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

With respect to claim 16, Gatto teaches “The gaming network system of claim 15, wherein the service request is formatted according to a service description language” in col. 15 lines 49-56.

20

With respect to claim 17, Gatto teaches "The gaming network system of claim 16, wherein the service description language is a Web Services Description Language (WSDL)" in col. 15 lines 49-56.

5 **With respect to claim 18**, WSA teaches "wherein the message director service is registered in a UDDI registry." on p. 38 first full para. lines 1-4.

10 **With respect to claim 19**, Drummond teaches "The gaming network system of claim 14, wherein the gaming client comprises a gaming machine" on para. 0002 lines 3-9.

15 **With respect to claim 20**, Drummond teaches "The gaming network system of claim 14, wherein the gaming client comprises a service provider in the gaming network" in para. 0099 lines 8-14 and Fig. 2 item 44, 40, and 42 (each ATM (gaming machine) provides services such as printer services (55, 61, and 75) and card reader services (54, and 60) among others)

20 **With respect to claim 21**, Drummond teaches "The gaming network system of claim 14, wherein the service request comprises a request by the gaming client to start receiving at least one specified event message from the message director service" on para. 0119 lines 1-3 and para. 0123 lines 4-9 and Fig. 8. (Once service registers for events, it receives events)

With respect to claim 22, it appears Drummond et al fails to explicitly teach
“The gaming network system of claim 14, wherein the service request comprises a
request by the gaming client to stop receiving at least one specified event message
5 from the message director service.”

However, Gatto teaches a computer informing another computer to stop sending
event notifications (messages) in col. 14 lines 24-27.

Drummond and Gatto are analogous art because they are from the same field of
endeavor—gaming machine configuration.

10 At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in
the art, having the teachings of Drummond and Gatto before him or her, to ATM
machine (gaming machine) of Drummond to include the ability of the user to send a
message to stop receiving events from the lookup service (message director service).

The motivation would have been to provide the predicted results of flexibility.
15 Drummond teaches that in order for an ATM's services to stop receiving data from a
lookup service, the ATM's service must be disconnected. See Drummond para 0128
lines 11-12. Allowing a user to stop receiving messages from a service without
disconnecting allows for more flexibility by giving the program and additional way to stop
receiving data from the service.

20 **With respect to claim 23,** Drummond teaches “The gaming network system of
claim 14, wherein the service request comprises a request by the gaming client to send

a message to the message director service" in para. 0119 lines 1-3 and para. 0123 lines 4-9 and Fig. 8. (Once service registers for events, it receives events. Events are messages)

5 **With respect to claim 25**, Drummond also teaches gaming machines and transactions representative of value. See Drummond para. 0002 1-7. However, Drummond fails to explicitly teach "The gaming network system of claim 23, wherein the event message comprises a gaming machine play event". However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that event messages would
10 include gaming machine play events because transactions representative of value (wagers, etc) are commonly known the art to be required to play a game.

**Claims 11 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drummond (U.S. Patent App. Pub No. 2001/0014881 A1) in view of Gatto (U.S. Patent No. 6,916,247) and further in view of WSA and Jewell as applied to
15 claims 10 and 14 above and further in view of Brown (U.S. Patent Application Pub. 2003/0110242).**

With respect to claim 11, it appears Drummond, et al fails to explicitly teach
20 "The method of claim 10, wherein the event message conforms to an XML format"

However, Brown teaches using XML to send information from one program to another in para. 0010 lines 1-7.

Drummond and Brown are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor—configuration of program services.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Drummond and Brown before him or her, modify the
5 messages in Drummond to conform to the XML format.

The motivation would have been to provide the predicted results allowing programs to communicate with each other regardless of the platform they run on. See Brown para. 0010 lines 10-14.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gatto with Drummond to
10 obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

With respect to claim 24, it appears Drummond et al. fail to explicitly teach "The gaming network system of claim 14, wherein the event message conforms to an XML format."

15 However, Brown teaches using XML to send information from one program to another in para. 0010 lines 1-7.

Drummond and Brown are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor—configuration of program services.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in
20 the art having the teachings of Drummond and Brown before him or her, modify the messages in Drummond to conform to the XML format.

The motivation would have been to provide the predicted results allowing programs to communicate with each other regardless of the platform they run on. See Brown para. 0010 lines 10-14.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gatto with Drummond to
5 obtain the invention as specified in claim 24.

Response to Arguments

Examiner agrees that claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record.

However, Examiner submits that claim 14 is not allowable because claim 14 uses the
10 words "operable to". Examiner interprets this language as "intended use" language that that does not limit the scope of the claims. See MPEP 2106 II C ("[t]he subject matter of a properly construed claim is defined by the terms that limit its scope. It is this subject matter that must be examined. As a general matter, the grammar and intended meaning of terms used in a claim will dictate whether the language limits the claim scope.
15 Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. The following are examples of language that may raise a question as to the limiting effect of the language in a claim: (A) statements of intended use or field of use, (B) "adapted to" or 'adapted for' clauses, (C) 'wherein' clauses, or (D) 'whereby'
20 clauses. This list of examples is not intended to be exhaustive"). See also MPEP 2111.04.

Thus, any elements recited after "operable to" do not limit the claim's scope. The elements "a gaming network system providing a message director service, the gaming network system comprising: a plurality of gaming clients communicably coupled to the gaming network, each of the gaming clients comprising one or more processors

5 executing from a memory a message director service on a server computer having one or more processors and communicably coupled to the gaming network, wherein the message director service receives an event message from one or more of a plurality of gaming clients on the gaming network and in response receiving- the event message the message director service utilizes configuration data to route the event message to

10 one or more gaming clients on the gaming network" and "a discovery agent" are unpatentable over Drummond and Gato for the reasons indicated above. Thus, claim 14 is not allowable because Drummond and Gato are not required to teach the "operable to" portions of the claim.

In order to make claim 14 allowable, Examiner recommends removing the words

15 "operable to". For example, claim 14 would read "wherein the discovery agent receives service information . . . determines if the message director service is authentic . . . publishes the service information. . . ", etc.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Albert Phillips whose telephone number is 571-270-3256. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri. 9:30am-7pm; First Fri Off.

- 5 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James K. Trujillo can be reached on (571)272-3677. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

- Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a
- 10
- 15 USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Albert Phillips/
Examiner, Art Unit 2159 3/23/11

/James Trujillo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2159